arXiv:1510.00602v1 [math.PR] 2 Oct 2015

Convergence of the consistent maximal displacement of the branching random walk

Bastien Mallein*

October 5, 2015

Abstract

We consider a supercritical branching random walk on $\mathbb{R}$. The consistent maximal displacement is the minimum of the distances between the trajectories of individuals at the nth generation and the boundary of the process. It has been proved by Fang and Zeitouni [8] and by Faraud, Hu and Shi [9] that the consistent maximal displacement grows at rate $\lambda^* n^{1/3}$ for an explicit λ^*. We obtain here a necessary and sufficient condition for this asymptotic behaviour to hold.

1 Introduction

A branching random walk on $\mathbb{R}$ is a process defined as follows. It starts with one individual located at 0 at time 0. Its children are positioned on $\mathbb{R}$ according to the law $\mathcal{L}$ of a point process, and form the first generation of the process. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, every individual in the n-th generation make children around their current positions according to independent point processes with the same law $\mathcal{L}$. We write $\mathbf{T}$ for the genealogical tree of the population. For any $u \in \mathbf{T}$ we denote by $V(u)$ the position of the individual u and by $|u|$ the generation to which u belongs. The random marked tree $(\mathbf{T}, V)$ is the branching random walk with reproduction law $\mathcal{L}$.

We assume the Galton-Watson tree $\mathbf{T}$ is supercritical i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=1} 1\right] > 1, \tag{1.1}$$

and we write S the survival event. We also assume the branching random walk $(\mathbf{T}, V)$ is in the boundary case (in the sense of [5])

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=1} e^{-V(u)}\right] = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=1} V(u)e^{-V(u)}\right] = 0. \tag{1.2}$$

Biggins [4] proved that $\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{\max_{|u|=n} V(u)}{n} = 0$ a.s. under these assumptions. Any branching random walk with mild integrability assumption can be normalized to be in the boundary case, see e.g. Bérard and Gouéré [3].

*DMA, École Normale Supérieure (Paris).

Let $n \geq 0$. For any $u \in \mathbf{T}$ such that $|u| = n$ and $k \leq n$ we denote by u_k the ancestor of u alive at generation k. The consistent maximal displacement of the branching random walk is the quantity defined as

$$L_n = \min_{|u|=n} \max_{k \leq n} V(u_k). \tag{1.3}$$

It correspond to the maximal distance between the boundary of the branching random walk and the individual that stayed as close as possible to it. The asymptotic behaviour of L_n has been studied by Fang and Zeitouni [8] and by Fauraud, Hu and Shi [9]. Under stronger integrability assumptions, they proved that L_n behaves as $\lambda^* n^{1/3}$ a.s. We give here a necessary and sufficient condition for this asymptotic behaviour to hold. Roberts [18] computed the second order of the asymptotic behaviour of L_n for the branching Brownian motion.

We add the two following integrability conditions

$$\sigma^2 := \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=1} V(u)^2 e^{-V(u)}\right] < +\infty, \tag{1.4}$$

$$\lim_{x \to +\infty} x^2 \, \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=1} e^{-V(u)} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{\log\left(\sum_{|v|=1} e^{-V(v)}\right) \geq x\right\}}\right] = 0. \tag{1.5}$$

Observe that (1.5) is strictly weaker than the classical integrability assumption that is [1, Assumption (1.4)]. This stronger assumption is necessary and sufficient to obtain the asymptotic behaviour of multiple quantities associated to the branching random walk, such as the minimal displacement, or the derivative martingale (see [1, 6]). We only need this weaker assumption to prove the following result.

Theorem 1.1. *We assume* (1.1), (1.2) *and* (1.4) *hold. Then* (1.5) *is a necessary and sufficient condition for*

$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{L_n}{n^{1/3}} = \left(\frac{3\pi^2\sigma^2}{2}\right)^{1/3} \quad \textit{a.s. on } S.$$

The rest of the article is organised as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the spinal decomposition of the branching random walkand the Mogul'skiĭ's small deviations estimate. These results are used to bound the left tail of L_n in Section 3. We end the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 4.

2 Preliminary results

2.1 Spinal decomposition of the branching random walk

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $W_n = \sum_{|u|=n} e^{-V(u)}$ and $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma\left(u, V(u), |u| \leq n\right)$. Under assumption (1.2), (W_n) is a non-negative $(\mathcal{F}_n)$-martingale. We introduce the probability $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\overline{\mathbb{P}}_{|\mathcal{F}_n} = W_n \mathbb{P}_{|\mathcal{F}_n}.$$

The spinal decomposition consists in an alternative description of $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ as a branching random walk with a distinguished individual that reproduce differently. It generalizes a similar construction for Galton-Watson processes, that can be found in [13]. This result has been proved by Lyons in [12]

Let $\mathbf{T}$ be a tree, a spine of $\mathbf{T}$ is a sequence $w = (w_n) \in \mathbf{T}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $|w_n| = n$ and for any $k \leq n$, $(w_n)_k = w_k$. We write $\mathcal{L}$ (respectively $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$) for the law of the point process $(V(u), |u| = 1)$ under law $\mathbb{P}$ (resp. $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$).

We introduce the law $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$ of a branching random walk with spine $(\mathbf{T}, V, w)$. It starts with a unique individual w_0 located at 0 at time 0. Its children are positioned according to a point process of law $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$. The individual w_1 is then chosen at random among these children u with probability proportional to $e^{-V(u)}$. Similarly at each generation n, every individual u makes children independently, according to law $\mathcal{L}$ if $u \neq w_n$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ otherwise; and w_{n+1} is chosen at random among the children v of w_n with probability proportional to $e^{V(v)}$.

Proposition 2.1 (Spinal decomposition, Lyons [12])**.** *Assuming* (1.2) *and* (1.4)*, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{|\mathcal{F}_n} = \overline{\mathbb{P}}_{|\mathcal{F}_n}$, and for any $|u| = n$,*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}\left(w_n = u \,|\mathcal{F}_n\right) = e^{-V(u)}/W_n,$$

and $(V(w_n), n \geq 0)$ is a centred random walk with variance σ^2.

As a straightforward consequence of the spinal decomposition comes the celebrated many-to-one lemma, that links additive moments of the branching random walk with random walk estimates. Its origins can be tracked back to the early work of Kahane and Peyrière [17, 11].

Lemma 2.2 (Many-to-one lemma)**.** *Assuming* (1.2) *and* (1.4)*, there exists a centred random walk (S_n) with variance σ^2 such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and measurable non-negative function f,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=n} f(V(u_j), j \leq n)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{S_n} f(S_j, j \leq n)\right].$$

Proof. We apply the spinal decomposition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=n} f(V(u_j), j \leq n)\right] &= \overline{\mathbb{E}}\left[\frac{1}{W_n}\sum_{|u|=n} f(V(u_j), j \leq n)\right] \\
&= \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left[\sum_{|u|=n} \frac{e^{-V(u)}}{W_n} e^{V(u)} f(V(u_j), j \leq n)\right] \\
&= \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left[\sum_{|u|=n} \mathbf{1}_{\{w_n=u\}} e^{V(u)} f(V(u_j), j \leq n)\right] = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left[e^{V(w_n)} f(V(w_j), j \leq n)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

The law of S under $\mathbb{P}$ is the same that the law of $(V(w_n), n \geq 0)$ under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$. □

2.2 Small deviation estimate for enriched random walk

Let $(X_n, \xi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. vectors in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}(X_n) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}(X_n^2) = \sigma^2 \in (0, +\infty). \tag{2.1}$$

We write $T_n = T_0 + X_1 + \cdots + X_n$ and we call $((T_n, \xi_n), n \geq 0)$ an enriched random walk. For any $z \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{P}_z$ is the probability such that $\mathbb{P}_z(T_0 = z) = 1$. We simply write $\mathbb{P}$ for $\mathbb{P}_0$. We study in this section the probability that an enriched random walk stays during n unites of time in an interval of width $o(n^{1/2})$, generalizing the Mogul'skiĭ small deviation estimate [16].

Theorem 2.3. *Let (a_n) be a sequence of real non-negative numbers such that*

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} a_n = +\infty, \quad \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{a_n^2}{n} = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \limsup_{n\to+\infty} a_n^2 \mathbb{P}(\xi_1 \geq n) = 0.$$

Assuming (2.1)*, for any pair of continuous functions $f < g$ and x, x', y, y' such that $f(0) < x \leq 0 \leq x' < g(0)$ and $f(1) \leq y < y' \leq g(1)$ we have*

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{a_n^2}{n} \log \sup_{z\in[x,x']} \mathbb{P}_{za_n}\left(\tfrac{T_n}{a_n} \in [y, y'], \tfrac{T_j}{a_n} \in [f(j/n), g(j/n)], \xi_j \leq n, j \leq n\right) = -\frac{\pi^2\sigma^2}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{ds}{(g(s) - f(s))^2}.$$

Theorem 2.3 is a consequence of [15, Corollary 2.5] and [15, Lemma 2.6]. Using similar demonstration techniques, we prove that if ξ_1 has a too heavy tail, then Theorem 2.3 does not hold.

Lemma 2.4. *Let (a_n) be a sequence of real non-negative numbers such that*

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} a_n = +\infty, \quad \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{a_n^2}{n} = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \limsup_{n\to+\infty} a_n^2 \mathbb{P}(\xi_1 \geq n) > 0.$$

Assuming (2.1)*, for any continuous functions $f < g$ such that $f(0) < 0 < g(0)$ we have*

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{a_n^2}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\tfrac{T_j}{a_n} \in [f(\tfrac{j}{n}), g(\tfrac{j}{n})], \xi_j \leq n, j \leq n\right) < -\frac{\pi^2\sigma^2}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{ds}{(g(s) - f(s))^2}.$$

Proof. Note that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tfrac{T_j}{a_n} \in [f(j/n), g(j/n)], \xi_j \leq n, j \leq n\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(\xi_1 \leq n)^n \leq \exp(-n\mathbb{P}(\xi_1 > n)).$$

Consequently, if $\limsup_{n\to+\infty} a_n^2 \mathbb{P}(\xi_1 \geq n) = +\infty$, then the proof is immediate. Therefore, we assume in the rest of the proof that

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} a_n^2 \mathbb{P}(\xi_1 \geq n) \in (0, +\infty). \tag{2.2}$$

Let B be a Brownian motion, we prove in a first time there exists $c > 0$ such that for any $T > 0$ and $a < 0 < b$,

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\tfrac{T_j}{a_n} \in [a, b], \xi_j \leq n, j \leq Ta_n^2\right) \leq e^{-cT} \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma B_s \in [a, b], s \leq T\right). \tag{2.3}$$

By Donsker's invariance principle [7], $\lim_{n\to+\infty}(T_{ta_n^2}/a_n, t \le T) = \sigma B$ in law. For $0 \le k \le n$, let $S_k^{(n)} = \sum_{j=1}^k X_j \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_j \le n\}}$ and $P_n = \sum_{k=1}^{Ta_n^2} \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_j > n\}}$ which are two independent quantities. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{j\le Ta_n^2}\left|S_j^{(n)} - T_j\right|/a_n\right] &\le \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{Ta_n^2}\mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_j>n\}}|X_j|/a_n\right]\\ &\le Ta_n\,\mathbb{E}\left[|X_1|\mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_1>n\}}\right]\\ &\le \mathbb{E}\left[X_1^2\mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_1>n\}}\right]^{1/2}\left(T^2a_n^2\mathbb{P}(\xi_1>n)\right) \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently $S^{(n)}_{\cdot/a_n^2}/a_n$ also converges in law toward B.

By (2.2), there exists $c > 0$ and an increasing sequence (n_k) such that $\lim_{k\to+\infty} a_{n_k}^2\mathbb{P}(\xi_1 > n_k) = c$. Therefore P_{n_k} converges in law toward a Poisson random variable with parameter cT, that is independent of B. Thus

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty}\mathbb{P}\left[\tfrac{T_j}{a_{n_k}} \in [a,b], \xi_j \le n_k, j \le Ta_{n_k}^2\right] = \mathbb{P}\left(B_s \in [a,b], s \le T\right)e^{-cT},$$

proving (2.3).

In a second time, we prove that for any $a < b$, we have

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty}\frac{a_n^2}{n}\log\sup_{x\in[a,b]}\mathbb{P}_{xa_n}\left(\tfrac{T_j}{a_n} \in [a,b], \xi_j \le n, j \le n\right) \le -c - \frac{\pi^2\sigma^2}{2(b-a)^2}. \quad (2.4)$$

Let $T > 0$, we set $r_n = \lfloor Ta_n^2\rfloor$. Applying the Markov property, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{x\in[a,b]}\mathbb{P}_{xa_n}\left(\tfrac{T_j}{a_n} \in [a,b], \xi_j \le n, j \le n\right)\\ &\qquad\le \sup_{x\in[a,b]}\mathbb{P}_{xn^{1/3}}\left(\tfrac{T_j}{a_n} \in [a,b], \xi_j \le n, j \le r_n\right)^{\lceil n/r_n\rceil},\end{aligned}$$

consequently

$$\begin{aligned}&\liminf_{n\to+\infty}\frac{a_n^2}{n}\log\sup_{x\in[a,b]}\mathbb{P}_{xa_n}\left(\tfrac{T_j}{a_n} \in [a,b], \xi_j \le n, j \le n\right)\\ &\qquad\le \liminf_{T\to+\infty}\frac{1}{T}\liminf_{n\to+\infty}\log\sup_{x\in[a,b]}\mathbb{P}_{xa_n}\left(\tfrac{T_j}{a_n} \in [a,b], \xi_j \le n, j \le Ta_n^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$, we set $M = \lceil\frac{b-a}{\epsilon}\rceil$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{x\in[a,b]}\mathbb{P}_{xa_n}\left(\tfrac{T_j}{a_n} \in [a,b], \xi_j \le n, j \le Ta_n^2\right)\\ &\qquad\le \max_{m\le M}\sup_{x\in[a+m\epsilon,a+(m+1)\epsilon]}\mathbb{P}_{xa_n}\left(\tfrac{T_j}{a_n} \in [a,b], \xi_j \le n, j \le Ta_n^2\right)\\ &\qquad\le \max_{m\le M}\mathbb{P}\left(\tfrac{T_j}{a_n} \in [-(m+1)\epsilon, (M-m+1)\epsilon], \xi_j \le n, j \le Ta_n^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

By (2.3), and letting $\epsilon \to 0$, we have

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty}\sup_{x\in[a,b]}\mathbb{P}_{xa_n}\left(\tfrac{T_j}{a_n} \in [a,b], \xi_j \le n, j \le n\right) \le \mathbb{P}\left(B_s \in [a,b], s \le T\right)e^{-cT}.$$

As a result, letting $T \to +\infty$ we obtain (2.4).

In a third time, approaching f and g by staircase functions, and applying (2.4) on each subset on which the functions are constants, we finally obtain

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{a_n^2}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{T_j}{a_n} \in [f(\tfrac{j}{n}), g(\tfrac{j}{n})], \xi_j \le n, j \le n\right) < -\frac{\pi^2\sigma^2}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{ds}{(g(s)-f(s))^2}.$$

□

3 Tail of the consistent maximal displacement

We compute in this section the left tail of L_n. We set

$$\lambda^* = \left(\frac{3\pi^2\sigma^2}{2}\right)^{1/3}, \tag{3.1}$$

and we prove that for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$,

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \log \mathbb{P}(L_n \le \lambda n^{1/3}) = \lambda - \lambda^*. \tag{3.2}$$

We first provide an upper bound, that is obtained without assuming (1.5).

Lemma 3.1. *Under assumptions* (1.1), (1.2) *and* (1.4), *for any* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, *we have* $\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \log \mathbb{P}\left(L_n \le \lambda n^{1/3}\right) \le \lambda - \lambda^*$.

Proof. Let $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, we introduce the function $f : t \in [0,1] \mapsto \lambda - \lambda^*(1-t)^{1/3}$. We set $I_j^{(n)} = \left[f(j/n)n^{1/3}, \lambda n^{1/3}\right]$. As $f(0) < 0$ and $f(1) = \lambda$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(L_n \le \lambda n^{1/3}\right) =& \mathbb{P}\left(\exists |u| = n : V(u_j) \le \lambda n^{1/3}, j \le n\right) \\
\le& \mathbb{P}\left(\exists |u| \le n : V(u) \le f(|u|/n)n^{1/3}, V(u_j) \in I_j^{(n)}, j < |u|\right) \\
\le& \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=k} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(u) \le f(k/n)n^{1/3}, V(u_j) \in I_j^{(n)}, j<k\right\}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $k \le n$, by Lemma 2.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=k} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(u) < f(k/n)n^{1/3}, V(u_j) \in I_j^{(n)}, j<k\right\}}\right] \\
=& \mathbb{E}\left[e^{S_k} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{S_k < f(k/n)n^{1/3}, S_j \in I_j^{(n)}, j<k\right\}}\right] \le e^{\lambda f(k/n)n^{1/3}} \mathbb{P}\left(S_j \in I_j^{(n)}, j < k\right).
\end{aligned}$$

We set $A > 0$. For any $a \le A$, we write $m_a = \lfloor na/A \rfloor$. As f is increasing, for any $k \in (m_a, m_{a+1}]$,

$$e^{f(k/n)n^{1/3}} \mathbb{P}\left(S_j \in I_j^{(n)}, j < k\right) \le e^{f((a+1)/A)n^{1/3}} \mathbb{P}\left(S_j \in I_j^{(n)}, j \le m_a\right).$$

Therefore, letting $n \to +\infty$ we obtain by Theorem 2.3,

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \log \mathbb{P}\left(L_n \le \lambda n^{1/3}\right) \le \max_{a<A} f(\tfrac{a+1}{A}) - \frac{\pi^2\sigma^2}{2} \int_0^{a/A} \frac{ds}{(\lambda - f(s))^2}$$
$$\le \max_{a<A} f(\tfrac{a+1}{A}) - \frac{3\pi^2\sigma^2}{2(\lambda^*)^2} \left(1 - (1 - \tfrac{a}{A})^{1/3}\right).$$

As $\frac{3\pi^2\sigma^2}{2(\lambda^*)^2} = \lambda^*$, letting $A \to +\infty$ we obtain

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \log \mathbb{P}\left(L_n \le \lambda n^{1/3}\right) \le \lambda - \lambda^*,$$

which concludes the proof. □

To bound from above the consistent maximal displacement, we prove that with high probability, there exists an individual staying below $\lambda n^{1/3}$ for n units of time, as soon as λ is large enough. To do so, we compute the first two moments of the number of individuals staying in two well-chosen lines, while making "not too many children".

Lemma 3.2. *Assuming* (1.1), (1.2), (1.4) *and* (1.5), *for any* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, *we have* $\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \log \mathbb{P}\left(L_n \le \lambda n^{1/3}\right) \ge \lambda - \lambda^*$.

Proof. Let $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, $\delta > 0$, and $f : t \in [0,1] \mapsto \lambda - \lambda^*(1 + \delta - t)^{1/3}$. We denote by $I_j^{(n)} = \left[f(j/n)n^{1/3}, \lambda n^{1/3}\right]$ for $j \le n$. Let $u \in \mathbf{T}$, we write $\Omega(u)$ for the set of children of u and $\xi(u) = \log \sum_{v\in\Omega(u)} e^{V(u)-V(v)}$. We set

$$Z_n = \sum_{|u|=n} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(u_j)\in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(u_j)\le \delta n^{1/3}, j\le n\right\}}.$$

We compute the two first moments of Z_n to bound from below $\mathbb{P}(Z_n > 0)$.

By spinal decomposition, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_n) = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\sum_{|u|=n} \frac{e^{-V(u)}}{W_n} e^{V(u)} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(u_j)\in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(u_{j-1})\le \delta n^{1/3}, j\le n\right\}}\right)$$
$$= \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(e^{V(w_n)} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(w_j)\in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(w_{j-1})\le \delta n^{1/3}, j\le n\right\}}\right)$$
$$\ge e^{f(1)n^{1/3}} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}\left(V(w_j) \in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(w_{j-1}) \le \delta n^{1/3}, j \le n\right).$$

We observe that $(V(w_n), \xi(w_{n-1})/\delta)$ is an enriched random walk, and by (1.5) we have $\lim_{n\to+\infty} n^{2/3} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}\left(\xi(w_0) \ge \delta n^{1/3}\right) = 0$. Consequently, Theorem 2.3 yields

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \log \mathbb{E}(Z_n) \ge f(1) - \frac{\pi^2\sigma^2}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{ds}{(\lambda - f(s))^2} \ge \lambda - \lambda^*(1+\delta)^{1/3}. \quad (3.3)$$

Similarly, to compute the second moment we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(Z_n^2) &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(Z_n \sum_{|u|=n} \frac{e^{-V(u)}}{W_n} e^{V(u)} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(u_j)\in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(u_{j-1})\leq \delta n^{1/3}, j\leq n\right\}}\right)\\ &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(Z_n e^{V(w_n)} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(w_j)\in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(w_{j-1})\leq \delta n^{1/3}, j\leq n\right\}}\right)\\ &\leq e^{\lambda n^{1/3}} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(Z_n \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(w_j)\in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(w_{j-1})\leq \delta n^{1/3}, j\leq n\right\}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Under the law $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$, Z_n can be decomposed as follows

$$Z_n = \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(w_j)\in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(w_{j-1})\leq \delta n^{1/3}, j\leq n\right\}} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sum_{\substack{u\in\Omega(w_k)\\ u\neq w_{k+1}}} Z_n(u),$$

where $Z_n(u) = \sum_{|v|=n, v>u} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(u_j)\in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(u_{j-1})\leq \delta n^{1/3}, j\leq n\right\}}$. We denote by

$$\mathcal{G} = \sigma\left(w_n, \Omega(w_n), V(u), u\in\Omega(w_n), n\geq 0\right).$$

Observe that conditionally on $\mathcal{G}_n$, for any $u\in\Omega(w_k)$ such that $u\neq w_{k+1}$, the subtree of the descendants of u has the law of a branching random walk starting from $V(u)$. Therefore, writing $\mathbb{P}_x$ for the law of $(\mathbf{T}, V+x)$, for any $k<n$ and $u\in\Omega(w_k)$ such that $u\neq w_{k+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left[Z_n(u)|\mathcal{G}\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{V(u)}\left[\sum_{|v|=n-k-1} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(v_j)\in I_{k+j+1}^{(n)}, \xi(v_{j-1})\leq \delta n^{1/3}, j\leq n-k-1\right\}}\right]\\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{V(u)}\left[\sum_{|v|=n-k-1} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(v_j)\in I_{k+j+1}^{(n)}, j\leq n-k-1\right\}}\right].\end{aligned}$$

Applying the many-to-one lemma, for any $x\in\mathbb{R}$ and $p\leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_x\left[\sum_{|v|=n-p} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(v_j)\in I_{p+j}^{(n)}, j\leq n-p\right\}}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[e^{S_{n-p}} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{S_j+x\in I_{p+j}^{(n)}, j\leq n-p\right\}}\right]\\ &\leq e^{\lambda n^{1/3}-x} \mathbb{P}\left(S_j + x\in I_{p+j}^{(n)}, j\leq n-p\right).\end{aligned}$$

Let $A>0$, for any $a\leq A$ we set $m_a = \lfloor na/A\rfloor$ and

$$\Psi_{a,A}^{(n)} = \sup_{y\in I_{m_a}^{(n)}} \mathbb{P}\left(S_j + y\in I_{m_a+j}^{(n)}, j\leq n-m_a\right).$$

For any $x\in\mathbb{R}$ and $m_a\leq k<m_{a+1}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_x\left[\sum_{|v|=n-k-1} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(v_j)\in I_{k+j+1}^{(n)}, j\leq n\right\}}\right] \leq e^{\lambda n^{1/3}-x} \Psi_{a+1,A}^{(n)},$$

yielding

$$\sum_{\substack{u\in\Omega(w_k)\\ u\neq w_{k+1}}} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left[Z_n(u)|\mathcal{G}\right] \leq e^{\lambda n^{1/3}}\Psi^{(n)}_{a+1,A}\sum_{u\in\Omega(w_k)} e^{V(u)} \leq e^{\lambda n^{1/3}+V(w_k)+\xi_k}\Psi^{(n)}_{a+1,A}.$$

Using the fact that $\xi(w_k)\leq \delta n^{1/3}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(Z_n^2) \leq\ & e^{\lambda n^{1/3}}\widehat{\mathbb{P}}\left[V(w_j)\in I_j^{(n)}, j\leq n\right]\\ &+ e^{(2\lambda+\delta)n^{1/3}}\sum_{a=0}^{A-1} n\Psi^{(n)}_{a+1,A}e^{-f(a/A)n^{1/3}}\widehat{\mathbb{P}}\left[V(w_j)\in I_j^{(n)}, j\leq n\right].\end{aligned}$$

Applying Theorem 2.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n^{1/3}}\log\mathbb{E}(Z_n^2) \leq\ & 2\lambda+\delta-\frac{\pi^2\sigma^2}{2}\int_0^1\frac{ds}{(\lambda-f(s))^2}\\ &-\min_{a<A} f(\tfrac{a}{A})-\frac{\pi^2\sigma^2}{2}\int_{(a+1)/A}^1\frac{ds}{(\lambda-f(s))^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Letting $A\to+\infty$, we obtain

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n^{1/3}}\log\mathbb{E}(Z_n^2)\leq\lambda+\delta-\lambda^*(1+\delta)^{1/3}. \tag{3.4}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $\mathbb{P}\left(L_n\leq\lambda n^{1/3}\right)\geq\mathbb{P}\left(Z_n>0\right)\geq\frac{\mathbb{E}(Z_n)^2}{\mathbb{E}(Z_n^2)}$, thus

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n^{1/3}}\log\mathbb{P}\left(L_n\leq\lambda n^{1/3}\right)\geq\lambda-\lambda^*(1+\delta)^{1/3}-\delta,$$

letting $\delta\to 0$ we conclude the proof. □

Note that Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 imply (3.2).

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Lemma 4.1. *Under assumptions* (1.1), (1.2), (1.4) *and* (1.5), *we have*

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\frac{L_n}{n^{1/3}}=\lambda^*\ \textit{a.s. on } S.$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon>0$. By Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n^{1/3}}\log\mathbb{P}(L_n\leq(\lambda^*-\epsilon)n^{1/3})<0.$$

Thus, using the Borel-Cantelli lemma we have $\liminf_{n\to+\infty}\frac{L_n}{n^{1/3}}\geq\lambda^*$ a.s.

We now turn to the upper bound of L_n. By Lemma 3.2, for any $\delta>0$,

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n^{1/3}}\log\mathbb{P}(L_n\leq\lambda^*n^{1/3})>-\delta.$$

We work in the rest of the proof conditionally on the survival event S. We write $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ for the subtree of $\mathbf{T}$ consisting of individuals having an infinite line of descent. By [2, Chapter 1, Theorem 12.1], $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ is a supercritical Galton-Watson process that never dies out. Applying [14, Lemma 2.9] to the branching random walk $(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}, V)$, there exists $a > 0$ and $\rho > 1$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}(p) = \{\#\{|u| = p : V(u_j) \geq -pa, \} \geq \rho^p\}$$

is verified a.s. for $p \geq 1$ large enough. Let $\eta > 0$, we set $p = \lfloor \eta n^{1/3} \rfloor$. Applying the Markov property at time p, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(L_{n+p} \geq (\lambda^* + A\eta)n^{1/3} | \mathcal{A}(p)\right) \leq \left(1 - \mathbb{P}\left(L_n \leq \lambda^* n^{1/3}\right)\right)^{\rho^p}.$$

Therefore by Borel-Cantelli lemma again,

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{L_n}{n^{1/3}} \leq \lambda^* + A\eta \quad \text{a.s. on } S.$$

We let $\eta \to 0$ to conclude the proof. □

Observe that by Lemma 3.1 and the Borel-Cantelli Lemma, we have

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{L_n}{n^{1/3}} \geq \lambda^* \text{ a.s.}$$

as soon as (1.1), (1.2) and (1.4) are verified. Therefore, to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1, we have to prove that if (1.5) fails, the consistent maximal displacement is infinitely often significantly larger than $\lambda^* n^{1/3}$.

Lemma 4.2. *Assuming* (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), *if*

$$\limsup_{x\to+\infty} x^2\, \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=1} e^{-V(u)} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{\log\left(\sum_{|v|=1} e^{-V(v)}\right) \geq x\right\}}\right] > 0, \tag{4.1}$$

then there exists $\eta > 0$ *such that* $\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{L_n}{n^{1/3}} \geq \lambda^* + \eta$ *a.s.*

Proof. To prove this lemma, we prove there exists $\lambda > \lambda^*$ such that

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \log \mathbb{P}(L_n \leq \lambda n^{1/3}) < 0. \tag{4.2}$$

Let $\lambda > \lambda^*$, $\delta > 0$ and $A > 0$. We set $f : t \in [0,1] \mapsto \lambda - (\lambda^3 - (\lambda^*)^3(t+\delta))^{1/3}$ and $I_j^{(n)} = [f(j/n)n^{1/3}, \lambda n^{1/3}]$. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(L_n \leq \lambda n^{1/3}) \leq\ & \mathbb{P}(\exists |u| \leq n : V(u) > f(|u|/n)n^{1/3}, V(u_j) \leq \lambda n^{1/3}) \\ & + \mathbb{P}(\exists |u| < n : \xi(u) > An^{1/3}, V(u_j) \in I_j^{(n)}, j \leq |u|) \\ & + \mathbb{P}(\exists |u| = n : V(u_j) \in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(u_{j-1}) \leq An^{1/3}, j \leq n).\end{aligned}$$

We bound these three probabilities separately.

We first write $X_n = \sum_{|u|\leq n} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(u)\geq f(|u|/n)n^{1/3}, V(u_j)\in I_j^{(n)}, j<|u|\right\}}$. Using the same techniques as in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \log \mathbb{P}(\exists |u| \leq n : V(u) > f(|u|/n)n^{1/3}, V(u_j) \leq \lambda n^{1/3})$$
$$\leq \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \log \mathbb{E}(X_n) \leq \sup_{t\in[0,1]} f(t) - \frac{\pi^2\sigma^2}{2} \int_0^t \frac{ds}{(f(s)-\lambda)^2} < 0. \quad (4.3)$$

We then study $Y_n = \sum_{|u|\leq n} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(u_j)\in I_j^{(n)}, j<|n|\right\}}$. Following similar arguments, there exists $\mu > 0$ large enough such that $\mathbb{E}(Y_n) \leq e^{\mu n^{1/3}}$. Moreover, by (1.2) we have $\mathbb{P}(\xi(u) \geq x) \leq e^{-x}$. Consequently

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists |u| < n : \xi(u) > An^{1/3}, V(u_j) \in I_j^{(n)}, j \leq |u|)$$
$$\leq \mathbb{P}\left(Y_n \geq e^{2\mu n^{1/3}}\right) + e^{2\mu n^{1/3}} \mathbb{P}(\xi(u) \geq An^{1/3}) \leq e^{-\mu n^{1/3}} + e^{(2\mu - A)n^{1/3}},$$

thus for $A > 0$ large enough,

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \log \mathbb{P}(\exists |u| < n : \xi(u) > An^{1/3}, V(u_j) \in I_j^{(n)}, j \leq |u|) < 0. \quad (4.4)$$

Finally, we consider $Z_n = \sum_{|u|=n} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{V(u_j)\in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(u_{j-1})\leq An^{1/3}, j\leq n\right\}}$. Using the spinal decomposition, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_n) \leq e^{\lambda n^{1/3}} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}\left(V(w_j) \in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(w_{j-1}) \leq An^{1/3}, j \leq n\right).$$

By (4.1), we may apply Lemma 2.4, to obtain

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \log \widehat{\mathbb{P}}\left(V(w_j) \in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(w_{j-1}) \leq An^{1/3}, j \leq n\right)$$
$$< -\frac{\pi^2\sigma^2}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{ds}{(\lambda - f(s))^2}. \quad (4.5)$$

Thus, choosing $\lambda > 0$ close enough to λ^* and $\delta > 0$ small enough, we have

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \log \mathbb{P}(\exists |u| = n : V(u_j) \in I_j^{(n)}, \xi(u_{j-1}) \leq An^{1/3}, j \leq n) < 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Therefore, by (4.3), (4.4) and (4.6) we obtain (4.2). □

Theorem 1.1 is a consequence of Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2.

References

[1] Elie Aïdékon. Convergence in law of the minimum of a branching random walk. *Ann. Probab.*, 41(3A):1362–1426, 2013.

[2] K. B. Athreya and P. E. Ney. *Branching processes*. Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2004. Reprint of the 1972 original [Springer, New York; MR0373040].

[3] J. Bérard and J.-B. Gouéré. Survival probability of the branching random walk killed below a linear boundary. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 16:no. 14, 396–418, 2011.

[4] J. D. Biggins. The first- and last-birth problems for a multitype age-dependent branching process. *Advances in Appl. Probability*, 8(3):446–459, 1976.

[5] J. D. Biggins and A. E. Kyprianou. Fixed points of the smoothing transform: the boundary case. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 10:no. 17, 609–631, 2005.

[6] X. Chen. A necessary and sufficient condition for the non-trivial limit of the derivative martingale in a branching random walk. *arXiv preprint*, 2014. arXiv:1402.5864.

[7] Monroe D. Donsker. An invariance principle for certain probability limit theorems. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.,*, 1951(6):12, 1951.

[8] M. Fang and O. Zeitouni. Consistent minimal displacement of branching random walks. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 15:106–118, 2010.

[9] G. Faraud, Y. Hu, and Z. Shi. Almost sure convergence for stochastically biased random walks on trees. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 154(3-4):621–660, 2012.

[10] N. Gantert, Y. Hu, and Z. Shi. Asymptotics for the survival probability in a killed branching random walk. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 47(1):111–129, 2011.

[11] J.-P. Kahane and J. Peyrière. Sur certaines martingales de Benoit Mandelbrot. *Advances in Math.*, 22(2):131–145, 1976.

[12] R. Lyons. A simple path to Biggins' martingale convergence for branching random walk. In *Classical and modern branching processes (Minneapolis, MN, 1994)*, volume 84 of *IMA Vol. Math. Appl.*, pages 217–221. Springer, New York, 1997.

[13] R. Lyons, R. Pemantle, and Y. Peres. Conceptual proofs of $L \log L$ criteria for mean behavior of branching processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 23(3):1125–1138, 1995.

[14] B. Mallein. Branching random walk with selection at critical rate. *arXiv preprint*, 2015. arXiv:1502.07390.

[15] B. Mallein. N-branching random walk with α-stable spine. *arXiv preprint*, 2015. arXiv:1503.03762.

[16] A. A. Mogul′skiĭ. Small deviations in the space of trajectories. *Teor. Verojatnost. i Primenen.*, 19:755–765, 1974.

[17] J. Peyrière. Turbulence et dimension de Hausdorff. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A*, 278:567–569, 1974.

[18] M. I. Roberts. Fine asymptotics for the consistent maximal displacement of branching Brownian motion. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 20:no. 28, 26, 2015.